

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 12, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire April 12, 2004. Claims 1-4, 6-21, 23-40, 42-63 are pending. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 18, 40, 43, 44, 48 and 52 and have canceled Claims 5, 22, 41 and 53. Amendments to the specification have been made to identify cross-related applications. No new matter has been entered by these amendments.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103

On page 2 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-8, 12, 14, 18-25, 29, 31 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Janis*, United States Patent No. 5,263,157. On page 5 of the present Office Action, Claims 9-11, 13, 17, 26-28, 30 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Janis*, United States Patent No. 5,263,157 and in view of *Rabne et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,006,332. On page 7 of the present Office Action, Claims 15, 16, 32, 33, 40-42, 44-54 and 56-63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Janis*, United States Patent No. 5,263,157 and in view of *Bialick et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,003,135. Those rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the Claims is requested.

With respect to exemplary Claim 1 in the present application, it has been amended to incorporate the limitation of:

"transmitting a record of authorization from said particular authority-enabled system to a portable data storage medium associated with said particular user, in response to determining that said particular type of content is included within said selection of said particular types of content"

It is argued on page 4 of the present Office Action that this element of exemplary Claim 1 in the present application is taught by *Janis* at Figure 2 and col. 6-8. Applicants note that at the cited section of col. 6, therein is described blocks 88 and 90 in the process shown in Figure 4. As explained therein, block 88 represents a determination of whether or not access is permitted to the selected resource object. At block 90, there is illustrated accessing of a resource object and the subsequent termination of the process. While this process describes granting permission

for access, nothing within the description describes "*transmitting*" anything. More particularly, there is nothing that describes transmitting a "*record of authorization*."

Essentially, the process disclosed in Figure 4 is performed by a resource manager 46 in response to a request for a resource object 48 by another resource manager 40, for example. Once the decision at block 88 is performed and access is permitted, nothing is transmitted from resource manager 46 to reference monitor 50, reference monitor 44 or resource manager 40. More particularly, a "*record of authorization from said particular authority-enabling system*" is not transmitted.

Also, it should be pointed out that the decision at block 88 is whether or not the profile is permitted access to the selected resource object. Such access permission is not determined based on the "*type of content*" being "*included within said selection of said particular types of content*" requested, as is also recited in the above quoted element of exemplary Claim 1 in the present application.

With respect to exemplary Claim 40 in the present application, it has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 41, including:

comparing a particular authority from whom an entry for an authority-designated setting is received with said plurality of allowable authorities designated at said portable data storage medium; and

only storing said entry for said authority-designated setting at said portable data storage medium, in response to authorization of said particular authority in said plurality of allowable authorities.

The Examiner argues on page 8 of the present Office Action that this element is shown at Col. 5, lines 56-60. However, therein, a control profile is compared to determine if the user is authorized. An "authority" is not a profile. Moreover, the profile is not compared with other profiles. Moreover, the "*authority-designated setting*" is not stored anywhere. If it is assumed that the permitted access is the "*setting*" where is it stored? Therefore, Janis is not suggesting "*comparing a particular authority from whom an entry for an authority-designated setting is*

received with said plurality of allowable authorities."

With respect to exemplary Claim 43 in the present application, it has been amended to incorporate the limitations of its base claim and including:

encrypting said plurality of authority-designated settings at a portable computer system comprising said portable data storage medium such that only a particular selection from among said plurality of authority-enabled systems are enabled to read said plurality of authority-designated settings

While Rabne shows encryption, they do not show encrypting in a way that *only a particular selection from among said plurality of authority-enabled systems are enabled to read said plurality of authority-designated settings*. There is nothing the cited reference to suggest a combination of the references to encrypt in a way that only a particular authority can read the data. Instead, any profile having authority can access the objects.

Claim 44 recited “filtering”. At the section of Janis cited by the Examiner, as disclosing “filtering” there is only described providing the Reference Monitor to every system to allow access to objects. The reference monitor does not filter any profiles, preferences or settings prior to any access requests being transmitted.

With respect to Claim 48, therein is recited:

transmitting said plurality of user-designated preferences with said plurality of authority-designated preferences to said plurality of authority-enabled systems.

Janis is devoid of a teaching of transmitting “user” and “authority” preferences to systems.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Janis* does not show or suggest the present invention as claimed in exemplary Claim 1 in the present application. For the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Janis*, nor *Rabne*, nor *Bialick*, nor any combination thereof shows or suggests the present invention as claimed in exemplary Claim 1 or the remaining pending claims in the present application, and that the rejection of those claims

should be reconsidered.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig J. Yudell

Reg. No. 39,083

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

P.O. Box 201720

Austin, Texas 78720-1720

512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS